

09/914,523

Page 6 of 8

Remarks

Claims 1-8 and 23 are pending in the application.

Claim 1-8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶1, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling.

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oberg et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,915,075 (hereinafter Oberg).

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the

578587-1

09/914,523

Page 7 of 8

original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 2-6 are allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. The examiner's concerns have been addressed. For clarity purposes, claims 2-6 have been canceled, and new claims 24-28 written in conformance with 35 U.S.C. 112 to respectively parallel and include all limitations of canceled claims 2-6. Claim 23 has been amended to include the relevant limitations of allowable claim 2 (now claim 24), and should now also be allowable.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The applicant believes that all concerns have been addressed by the amendments to the claims discussed above.

Therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oberg. The Applicant believes all grounds for rejection have been made moot, based on the claims being rewritten into allowable form as discussed above.

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn. The rejection is traversed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

578587-1

09/914,523


Page 8 of 8

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully,

Yair Oren

Yossi Shussman

By 
Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414
732-530-9404

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

578587-1